DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 099 SP 027 415

AUTHOR Menlo, Allen
TITLE A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Teachers' Perceptions of Good Practice and Associated Factors in England, W. Germany, and the United States.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 85
NOTE 70p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th; San Francisco, CA, April 16-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Foreign Countries; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS England; West Germany

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a small, exploratory study which compared the perceptions and thinking of secondary school teachers in three countries--England, West Germany, and the United States--regarding teaching practice and several other factors which are related to the conduct of good practice. The study was conducted by the Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross Cultural Study Program, a consortium of faculty and graduate student research teams in education units in the three countries. The study was designed to produce speculative generalizations and implications in their own right, although it was primarily a pilot effort prerequisite to the planning of a large scale, cross cultural study by the consortium. One school site in each cultural setting was selected for data collection. A structured interview schedule with both open-ended and scaled-response questions was employed. Results regarding several factors are presented in this report. The factors include: dimensions of daily practice; good practice; and the expression of care and the assertion of control. Nineteen data tables are contained in the text. The interview questions and related instruments are appended. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268099

For presentation at the 1985
American Educational Research
Association Meetings; Special
Interest Group on International
Studies Session 52.07, April 4, 1985.

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS IN ENGLAND, W. GERMANY, AND THE UNITED STATES

Allen Menlo

Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program

School of Education, The University of Michigan

This paper reports a small, exploratory study which compares the perceptions and thinking of secondary teachers in three countries regarding good teaching practice and several other factors which would appear to relate to or impinge upon the conduct of good practice. The study was conducted in 1982-83 by the Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program -- a consortium of faculty and graduate student research teams in the Education units at the Universities of Frankfurt (West Germany), Michigan (U.S.A.), and Sheffield (England). The study was designed to produce speculative generalizations and implications in their own right, although it was primarily a pilot effort pre-requisite to the present planning of a large scale, cross-cultural study by the consortium. In more specific terms, one objective of the study was to

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Menlo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP027 415

explore similarities and differences between secondary teachers in the three cultural settings in regard to their descriptions of what constitutes good practice, their informal theories behind what constitutes good practice, their styles of theorizing, their perceptions of what forces help and hinder the implementation of good practice, the value they place on good practice, their perceptions of the extent to which they and their colleagues engage in good practice, and the extent to which the expression of care and the assertion of control are a part of what they describe as good practice. The other equally important objective was to acquire learnings in service of planning a larger scale study. These hoped-for learnings included the extent of viability of concepts, research questions, and methods, and the workability of the proposed procedures for collaboration between research teams separated by both distance and cultural difference. This paper reports the efforts related to the first objective. Efforts related to the second objective have been reported elsewhere. (Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program, 1983)

Rationale for the study's focus on good practice, reasoning about good practice, factors which help and hinder the conduct of good practice, care and control, and the use of cross-cultural comparison is as follows: The quantity and quality of various actions of practice of teachers within and outside the classroom are a significant source of influence on the academic learning and socio-emotional development of students. Recognition must be given to the fact that the behavior of teachers, like all persons, have motivational bases which, at times, are unconscious and in the service of self. But, most of what teachers plan to do in the service of student learning and development is driven, to a large extent, by their conscious

reasoning about its relevance to some aspect of the teaching-learning situation. What teachers actually do is mediated by factors within themselves and by other interpersonal, situational, and cultural factors in the immediate and farther-reaching environment, including the value placed on efforts toward certain good practices. Two concepts which have had a long history of prominence in the study of teaching, learning, and human development have been care and control. These concepts and others closely related by definition (positive regard, acceptance, valuing; power, influence, direction) have been identified as important conditions of an interpersonal relationship and of group and organizational climate. Strong evidence has been gathered regarding the importance of their influence on personal development, mental health, and learning. They are pivotal psychological and philosophical issues in all processes of socialization. The extent of the presence of each separately and the relative amounts of each jointly have continued to be key considerations in the determination of the nature of almost all human interactions and all helping relationships. The more that can be understood about teachers' perceptions of their practice, their beliefs about what comprises good practice, and their experiences with what forces help and hinder their engagement in good practice, then the greater the potential for teacher educators to plan effective programs of preparation and continuing professional education, as well as for school officials to make sound interventions in classroom and school life in the best interests of teaching and schooling. Cross-cultural comparisons between findings from each of the three countries provide the opportunity to extract understandings and develop recommendations more rich and firm than those developed from a unicultural base of information. In cross-cultural research, each culture

acts as yet another experimental setting to both test the universality of findings and discover the influence of the particular culture on the phenomena under consideration. While culturally-based differences of an epistomological, ontological, and valuational nature must be carefully considered, (Boyd and Menlo, 1984) findings of similarities and differences between cultural settings can be sources of understanding and recommendation for policy and practice within and across the settings.

Methodology

Since this inquiry was the first collaborative effort between the three research teams and was intended to provide grounding for a larger study, its form was limited to that of a pilot study. As such, one school site in each cultural setting was selected for data collection. The site in each cultural setting was a large comprehensive secondary school within an industrial city not dominated by a university. Each school had students of the ages 14 years to 16 years within the total school population and the school was not distinctly different from other comprehensive secondary schools in the city. All the teachers in the West German school who participated spoke English as a second language. The principal (rector, headmaster) solicited the interest of all teachers. Thirty-five teachers from the U.S. school (Flint, Michigan), 34 from the English school (Sheffield), and 12 from the West German school (Frankfurt) participated. The ratios of males to females were: U.S. 19:16, German 7:5, English 23:11. Ages ranged from the 20's to the 50's in all three settings with the average age being: U.S. 43 years, German 37 years, English 39 years. Ranges of years which teachers had taught were: U.S. 5-36

with average of 19 years, German 3-30 with an average of 11 years, and English 3-29 with an average of 14 years. The average class sizes were: U.S. 26, German 28, and English 25. Thus, it would appear that three samples of teachers did not differ markedly on the demographic dimensions just identified.

To collect information on the dimensions identified earlier, a structured interview schedule with both open-end and scaled-response questions was employed. Also employed were semantic differential (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) and sentence completion instruments. (See appendix for interview schedule and instruments). The schedule and instruments had been pre-tested with teachers in each cultural setting and were developed into forms with satisfactory clarity and intended stimulus value and with an average total completion time of two hours. The characteristics of each cultural setting's use of the English language, contributed equally to modifications of the interview schedule and sentence completion instrument during and following pre-testing. Interviews were conducted by research team members in their own cultural settings and were both tape and hand recorded.

An inductive procedure was used to develop code categories from clusters of alike responses to the open-end questions and the average member of times each category of response was given by teachers in each cultural setting was calculated. Mean scores on scaled response questions were calculated for each cultural setting. F ratios, pairwise comparisons, and chi-square were used in the analysis of data.

Results

Dimensions of Daily Practice

As a way of discovering what teachers perceived as the dimensions of their practice, they were asked to state the many things they do to contribute to the learning and development of their students in the settings of small or large groups, one-to-one, and by self. Table 1 presents each of the dimensions (categories) of teacher practice, the mean number of times per teacher that teachers' responses fell within each of the dimensions for each of the three cultural settings, the one-way analyses of varience (F ratios) and their accompanying levels of significance (p), and, wherever a two-way planned contrast reached at least a .05 level of significance, an abbreviated statement indicates the power position of each cultural setting's teachers regarding that dimension of practice.

As indicated in Table 1, teachers in the three cultural settings do not appear to differ on the greater extent to which they are involved in preparing for classroom teaching, facilitating classroom learning, helping students outside the classroom, and the small extent to which they give efforts toward sharing responsibility for maintaining school order. Sheffield teachers view themselves as interacting with colleagues, participating in formal school meetings, contributing to the school informational system, and working on school-parent-community relations moreso than do teachers in Flint and Frankfurt. Flint teachers see themselves as participating in professional meetings and attending to their own development more than Sheffield and Frankfurt teachers do. Frankfurt teachers do not appear to view any of their areas of practice at a level which is more

TABLE 1

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE DIMENSIONS OF THEIR PRACTICE

DIMENSIONS OF PRACTICE	FLINT (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
Preparations for classroom teaching and learning	2.82	2.33	2.79	.54	.58	
Facilitating learning in the classroom	3.82	3.42	3.09	.73	.48	
Helping students toward personal and social development outside the classroom	2.58	2.00	2.21	.85	.43	
Interacting with colleagues in the service of students, colleagues, and the school	1.36	1.92	2.50	5.30	.007	Sh>Fl
Participating in formal meetings on school policy and curriculum issues	.76	.25	1.35	6.14	.003	Sh>Fl,Fr
Participating in formal meetings for the development of the profession and self as a professional	.36	.08	.12	2.65	.077	Fl>Sh
Contributing to the informational system within the school	.06	.17	.88	27.36	.0000	Sh>Fl,Fr
Sharing the responsibility for the maintenance of order in the school	.06	.17	.12	.48	.62	
Working on inter-relationships between the school and community	1.03	1.00	1.76	5.88	.004	Sh>Fl,Fr
Attention to own physical, emotional and educational development	1.24	.75	.59	3.69	.03	Fl>S

extensive than do teachers in Flint and Sheffield. Thus, it would seem that teachers in the three settings are equally involved in direct work for and with students, that the English teachers are more involved in activities with other adults in the service of the school, and that the U.S. teachers give more efforts toward the development of the profession and their selves.

Good Practice

In order to find out what teachers view as good practice, they were asked to describe the particular way they carry out each practice they had just identified when that particular way is what they would think of as "better practice than at other times." In each table of Tables 2 through 7, a different dimension or combination of dimensions of practice is examined in regard to those particular ways of carrying out that practice which make it good practice. For each dimension of practice, the ways of good practice are listed and then treated on a comparative basis between the three cultural settings with the same type of analysis as in Table 1. The content of these tables provide clues to the teachers' meanings of good practice and the meanings which distinguish each teacher group from the others.

In examining Tables 2,3, and 4, each of which concerns good practice in the facilitation of student learning--preparing for it to happen in the classroom, doing it in the classroom, and doing it outside the classroom--the special thrust of each cultural setting's teachers appears to emerge. What seems to especially characterize the good practice of Flint teachers is the use of a wide range and variety of methods to help students understand, be

TABLE 2

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN PREPARING FOR CLASSROOM TEACHING AND LEARNING

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=32) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=8) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When lesson is based on students' needs, goals, and abilities	1.00	.62	.64	2.03	.14	
When content and methods are derived from a wide-range of sources	1.25	1.00	.39	5.91	.004	Fl>Sh
When lesson incorporates variety of innovativeness	.53	.87	.33	2.22	.12	Fr>Sh
When lesson is kept simple, organized, consistent, and fills time of session	.78	0.00	.45	1.95	.15	
When objectivity, consideration, attention, and timely return are exercised in the reviewing and grading of papers	.56	.12	.70	2.33	.10	Sh>Fr
When preparation is done on a regularly scheduled basis	.31	.12	.42	.74	.48	

TABLE 3

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN FACILITATING LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM GROUP

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=31) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=9) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When teacher uses procedures and methods which help students understand what is being presented	1.80	1.56	.79	4.68	.01	Fl>Sh
When teacher helps students feel encouraged, successful, recognized, and respected	.93	1.11	.41	2.79	.068	Fl,(Fr)>Sh
When teacher helps students interact, discuss, exchange ideas	.81	.22	.32	3.18	.047	Fl>Sh,(Fr)
When teacher makes learning relevant to students' life and concerns	.25	.78	.23	2.69	.07	Fr>Sh,Fl
When teacher helps students move ahead at their own rate and abilities	.55	.55	.56	.001	.999	
When teacher uses variety of methods to stimulate students	.90	.33	.38	2.71	.07	Fl>Sh
When teacher helps students take responsibility and leadership for learning and teaching	.52	.56	.64	.20	.82	
When teacher models positive behavior	.10	0.00	.15	.64	.53	

TABLE 4

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN HELPING STUDENTS TOWARD PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=29) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=8) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When teacher is positive, caring, relaxed, patient, and accessible to students	1.62	1.37	1.11	1.43	.25	
When teacher provides students with opportunity for responsibility and leadership	.45	.25	.32	.57	.57	
When teacher exposes students to a wide range of alternative opportunities	.52	.12	.62	1.40	.25	
When teacher is firm, fair, and gives direct advice	.72	0.00	.18	6.23	.003	Fl>Fr,Sh
When teacher takes prompt, appropriate and communication-opening actions	.55	.75	.26	2.09	.13	

TABLE 5

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN INTERACTING WITH COLLEAGUES, PARTICIPATING IN FORMAL SCHOOL MEETINGS, AND PARTICIPATING IN FORMAL PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=26) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=6) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When communication is open, supportive, personal, and human relationships are improved	1.85	1.17	1.79			
When meetings are useful, practical, organized, and issues discussed can be acted upon	1.65	.50	1.76			
When people give and receive ideas, information, and materials	1.15	1.17	.67			
When the experience enables broadening of self and one's ideas	1.31	.17	.24			
When attendance is limited and discussion is confidential	.11	0.00	.06	.39	.68	
When teachers provide service to school	.04	.33	.03	4.65	.01	Fr>Sh,Fl

TABLE 6

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN WORKING ON INTER-RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=21) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=5) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=31) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When honest, open, friendly communication takes place	1.19	1.00	1.38	.60	.55	
When problems and issues are dealt with in a direct, organized, factual way	.81	.40	.29	3.20	.048	Fl>Sh
When outside, useful information is acquired for students	.38	.20	.16	1.19	.31	
When the session is planned ahead of time, and parents and students are attending	.14	0.00	.45	2.79	.07	Sh>Fl,(Fr)

TABLE 7

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN ATTENDING TO THEIR OWN PHYSICAL, EMOTIONAL, AND EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

GOOD PRACTICES	FLINT (N=23) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=4) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=14) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
When your efforts can also result in improving your work with students	1.17	.25	.57	2.14	.13	
When you are serious about being a learner	.26	.25	.14	.18	.83	
When you take ongoing, good care of your physical, emotional, and spiritual needs	.87	1.00	.86	.04	.96	
When your efforts are through your membership in professional organizations	.04	0.00	0.00	.38	.69	

stimulated, interact, feel encouraged, recognized and respected, while also being firm and fair. The feature which appears to set the Frankfurt teachers apart from the others is the incorporation of innovativeness and life relevancy in learning. The distinctive quality of good practice for the Sheffield teachers appears to be a task-orientedness with special attention to objectivity, consideration, and timeliness. Of special interest is the almost perfect match between all three teacher groups in the extent to which they mention the accomodation of individual differences (helping students move ahead at their own rate and abilities) as good practice.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 address good practice in relations with school-related adults--colleagues, parents, and self. Each teacher group appears to be different from the other two on one component of good practice with adults. The Flint group places more emphasis on direct, organized and factual dealings with parents; the Sheffield group on pre-planning and student presence in contacts with parents; and the Frankfurt group on service to the school when interacting with colleagues.

Informal Theories Supporting the Goodness of Practice

In order to discover the beliefs and hypotheses which the teachers hold to support their views of what constitutes good practice, they were asked to tell why they felt the actions they described as good practice were indeed, good practice. In Table 8 the categories of reasons are listed and then treated on a comparative basis between the three cultural settings. This table speaks to the theorizing of teachers about good practice, i.e., their speculations about

TABLE 8

TEACHERS' REASONS FOR VIEWING PARTICULAR PRACTICES AS GOOD

REASONS	FLINT (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
Enhances communication and understanding between persons	2.24	2.83	3.68	4.46	.01	Sh>Fl
Increases interest, energy, involvement	1.82	2.33	1.73	.60	.55	
Provides emotionally supportive climate	2.30	3.25	1.15	6.48	.002	Fr,Fl>Sh
Uses learning principles	1.12	.67	.59	2.68	.07	Fl>Sh
Increases understanding, learning, performance	1.30	1.92	1.26	.86	.43	
Provides broader, more realistic, current view	1.09	.67	.68	1.43	.25	
Uses active approach	.27	.33	.06	2.10	.13	
Promotes development of leadership	.27	.08	0.00	5.11	.008	Fl>Sh
Helps deal with present and future life experiences	.54	.33	.73	.56	.58	
Helps students meet requirements	.54	.25	.38	.89	.41	
Relates to the ethics, or values of teacher	.36	.92	.88	1.89	.16	
Easier, better use of time, resources	1.48	0.00	2.03	4.90	.009	Sh,Fl>Fr
Best way, only way I know, it works	1.00	.42	1.20	1.52	.23	
Provides convincing evidence	.12	0.00	.52	4.62	.013	Sh>Fr,Fl
Serves teacher's or school's own purposes	1.24	1.67	.94	1.55	.22	

the positive consequences of certain ways of practice, or their statements of rationale for certain methods and teacher behaviors based on some perspective of learning which they value.

The Sheffield teachers' reasons for the goodness of a practice which differentiated themselves from the other two groups appear to have both a pragmatic-utilitarian (its easier, makes for better use of time and resources,provides convincing evidence) and human relations (enhances interpersonal communication and understanding) character. The Flint teachers seem to be dissimilar by giving more emphasis than the other two groups to a mental health (provides emotionally supportive climate) and personal growth (promotes development of leadership) perspective, as well as valuing knowledge as a source for developing practice (uses learning principles) and being pragmatic (its easier, makes for better use of time and resources). The Frankfurt teachers, like Flint but different from Sheffield, accentuated a mental health viewpoint (provides emotionally supportive climate).

Forces Which Help Teachers Conduct Good Practice

In an effort to understand what the teachers see as driving forces toward good practice, they were asked to identify the things which help them carry out each of the ways of good practice which they had mentioned. Table 9 displays the comparative analysis of the extent to which teachers in the three cultural settings identified forces within each of the categories listed.

TABLE 9

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF FORCES WHICH HELP THEM TO CARRY OUT GOOD PRACTICE

FORCES WHICH HELP	FLINT (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
My skills, sensitivities, awareness, and attitudes for building a constructive, positive relationship with students	4.06	1.92	1.59	11.19	.0001	Fl>Sh,Fr
My planning and use of effective class teaching methods	2.12	1.83	1.23	2.56	.08	Fl>Sh
My own background, experience, and knowledge	1.91	1.33	1.65	.28	.76	
My knowledge of and access to relevant information	.85	.58	.76	.20	.81	
Favorable personal characteristics, beliefs, commitment, life situation of self and other teachers	3.91	2.00	2.82	3.17	.048	Fl>Fr,(Sh)
Support and cooperation of other teachers and staff	1.06	1.33	2.41	5.99	.004	Sh>Fl,Fr
Administrative cooperation and support	.73	.75	.71	.01	.99	
Cooperative, responsible, responsive students	.94	2.42	1.03	4.6	.01	Fr>Fl,Sh
Availability of materials, human resources and facilities	3.12	1.42	2.17	3.55	.03	Fl>Fr,(Sh)
Flexibility and freedom in program and time	1.82	1.17	2.32	1.09	.34	
Inservice opportunities and professional interaction	1.12	.33	.21	5.23	.007	Fl>Fr,Sh
Community contacts and support	.82	.67	.73	.10	.90	

The Flint teachers distinguish themselves from the Frankfurt and Sheffield teachers by identifying more forces which help their conduct of good practice on a significantly stronger basis than the other two groups did. Three of these forces are related to their selves (their skills, sensitivities, attitudes; their use of effective teaching methods; and their favorable personal characteristics), another concerns the availibility of resources and facilities, and still another focuses on the existence of opportunities for inservice training and professional interaction. The force which Frankfurt teachers identified as helpful, more often than the other two teacher groups did, is when students are cooperative, responsible and responsive. Sheffield teachers more frequently mentioned the support and cooperation of other teachers and staff as a helping force. What appears especially interesting is the almost equal extent to which all three groups agreed on administrative cooperation and support as a force which helps them carry out good practice.

Forces Which Hinder Teachers from Conducting Good Practice

To understand what the teachers see as the restraining forces against good practice, they were asked to identify the things which limit or block their efforts at carrying out good practice. Table 10 shows the categories of hindering forces and the results of the analysis which compares teachers in the three settings regarding each of these categories.

One finding which would seem significant in its own right is that the force which was identified most often as a barrier to good practice by

TABLE 10

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF FORCES WHICH HINDER THEIR CARRYING OUT GOOD PRACTICE

FORCES WHICH BLOCK	FLINT (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=34) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
My lack of skills, sensitiveness, awarenesses and attitudes for building a constructive, positive relationship with students	.97	.33	.62	1.87	.16	
My lack of effective planning and use of effective classroom teaching methods	.27	.67	.21	2.75	.07	Fr>Sh,Fl
My lack of background, experience and knowledge	0.00	.75	.18	5.36	.007	Fr>Fl,Sh
My lack of knowledge and awareness of relevant information	.18	.17	.06	.84	.43	
Unfavorable personal characteristics, beliefs, commitment, life situation of self and other teachers	1.12	.83	.82	.40	.67	
Lack of support and cooperation of other teachers and staff	.64	1.17	1.59	5.37	.007	Sh>Fl
Lack of administrative cooperation and support	1.69	2.08	.64	4.48	.01	Fr,Fl>Sh
Lack of cooperativeness, responsibility-taking, responsiveness, maturity, ability of students	3.64	2.50	1.88	3.47	.04	Fl,Fr>Sh
Lack of availability of materials, human resources, facilities	2.91	1.67	1.56	4.42	.01	Fl>Sh,Fr
Lack of flexibility and freedom in program, time, and determination of student load	5.67	4.25	3.73	2.42	.096	Fl>Sh
Lack of inservice opportunities and professional interactions	.70	.08	.32	1.24	.29	
Poor community contacts and support	1.24	.58	1.50	2.00	.14	Sh>Fr
No hindrances	.64	.25	.91	1.05	.35	

teachers in each of three settings is the lack of flexibility and freedom in the use of time, in implementation of program, and in determination of own student load. The Flint teachers appear to experience, as hindering forces moreso than do the Sheffield teachers, a lack of administrative cooperation and support and a lack of cooperativeness and ability of students. They also seem to indicate, moreso than either of the other two groups, that a lack of resources and the inflexibilities in time and program usage are constraints to their conduct of good practice. The Frankfurt teachers mention, moreso than the Flint and Sheffield teachers, that their own lack of both effective planning and use of effective methods serve as forces restraining their conduct of good practice. Like Flint teachers, they identify a lack of both administrative support and student cooperation more frequently than do Sheffield teachers. Sheffield teachers, on the other hand, refer to a lack of support from other teachers and staff and to poor parent-community contacts as forces which hinder their carrying out of good practice moreso than do Flint or Frankfurt teachers.

Frequency and Importance of Engaging in Good Practice

Teachers were asked to rate, on a six-point verbal scale ranging from none of the time to all of the time, how much of the time they carried out each of their dimensions of practice in the ways they had described as good practice. They were also asked to do the same ratings for how much they thought other teachers in their school carried out good practice. Then they were asked to rate, on a five-point verbal scale ranging from not at all important to

TABLE 11

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FREQUENCY
OF THEIR OWN GOOD PRACTICE

SETTING	FREQUENCY (Mean)	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
FLINT (N=35)	4.67			
FRANKFURT (N=12)	3.54	9.36	.0002	Fl, S> Fr
SHEFFIELD (N=34)	4.41			

Lowest possible score = 1 Highest possible score = 6

TABLE 12

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FREQUENCY
OF OTHER TEACHERS' GOOD PRACTICE

SETTING	FREQUENCY (Mean)	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
FLINT (N=32)	3.77			
FRANKFURT (N=11)	2.96	6.27	.003	S,Fl>Fr
SHEFFIELD (N=34)	3.93			

Lowest Possible Score = 1 Highest Possible Score = 6

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE FREQUENCY OF THEIR OWN GOOD PRACTICE TO THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE FREQUENCY OF OTHER TEACHERS' GOOD PRACTICE

SETTING		FREQUENCY (Mean)	t	
FLINT (N=32)	OWN GOOD PRACTICE	4.64	7.45	p = .0000
	OTHER TEACHERS' GOOD PRACTICE	3.77		
FRANKFURT (N=11)	OWN GOOD PRACTICE	3.59	2.72	p = .02
	OTHER TEACHERS' GOOD PRACTICE	2.96		
SHEFFIELD (N=34)	OWN GOOD PRACTICE	4.41	4.07	p = .0003
	OTHER TEACHERS' GOOD PRACTICE	3.93		

Lowest Possible Score = 1 Highest Possible Score = 6

TABLE 14

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE
OF ENGAGING IN GOOD PRACTICE

SETTING	IMPORTANCE (Mean)	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
FLINT (N=34)	4.02			
FRANKFURT (N=9)	3.22	6.42	.003	S,Fl>Fr
SHEFFIELD (N=33)	4.07			

Lowest possible score = 1 Highest possible score = 5

extremely important, how important it is for other teachers in their school to engage in good practice on each of the dimensions of practice they had identified. Mean ratings were calculated for the responses to each of the three questions for each of the three cultural settings. Comparisons between the cultural settings of teachers were then made through a pairwise t-test analysis. Table 11 shows the comparison between the settings on teachers' perceptions of their own good practice and Table 12 does this for teachers' perceptions of other teachers' good practice. Table 13 displays the extent of difference between the teachers' perceptions of their own good practice and their perceptions of other teachers' good practice for each cultural setting. Table 14 compares the three settings on their teachers' perceptions of the importance of good practice.

The information in Tables 11-14 appears to indicate the following. The Flint and Sheffield teachers perceive the frequency of both their own good practice and that of their school colleagues as greater than the Frankfurt teachers do for themselves and their colleagues. In each of the three settings the teachers perceive themselves as engaging in good practice to a greater extent than they perceive their colleagues doing so. The Flint and Sheffield teachers appear to view the conduct of good practice as being more important than do the Frankfurt teachers.

The Expression of Care and the Assertion of Control

Two approaches were used to understand the meanings which the teachers have of care and control. One approach was to elicit elements of the

TABLE 15

TEACHERS' BEHAVIORAL DEFINITION OF CARE AND CONTROL

ELEMENTS OF BEHAVIOR	FLINT (N=33) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	SHEFFIELD (N=12) Mean Number of Times Mentioned	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
CARE						
Promotes warm, personal relationship with students	1.27	1.58	1.50	.41	.66	
Facilitates individual learning	.70	1.17	1.08	1.41	.25	
Creates positive classroom atmosphere	.45	.50	1.08	2.44	.096	Sh>Fl
Demonstrates professional commitment	.18	.33	0.00	1.56	.22	
Prepares for class	.15	.33	.75	4.97	.01	Sh>Fl,(Fr)
CONTROL						
Has organized educational plan	.45	1.10	.92	3.82	.03	Fr,(Sh)>Fl
Creates positive atmosphere for learning	.51	.20	1.17	5.01	.01	Sh>Fr,Fl
Creates a respectful relationship	.30	.20	.67	2.93	.06	Sh>Fl,Fr
Uses non-aversive control of action	.33	.30	1.08	5.76	.005	Sh>Fl,Fr
Directs student behavior through rules and expectations	.30	1.20	.42	4.86	.012	Fr>Fl,Sh
Uses aversive teacher behaviors	.36	.60	.50	.16	.85	

behavioral definition which teachers give to the two concepts. The other was to have teachers select words as attributes of the concepts.

A Behavioral Definition

At the end of each interview, the teacher was handed a sheet of paper and requested to respond to the two sentence completion items on it. One item read, "You can tell that a teacher is providing CARE for students when the teacher . . . " and the other item read "You can tell that a teacher is providing CONTROL for students when the teacher . . . " Table 15 presents the parts of a behavioral or operational definition of each of the two concepts as these parts inductively emerged from a process of clustering alike responses for each concept. Also presented are the average number of times per teacher, within each cultural setting, that each part of the definition for Care and for Control was mentioned. Then, the F ratios and p's are given for the analysis of variance between the three cultural settings, followed by the results of comparisons between pairs of the settings. The setting symbols contained within parentheses were not significant at the .05 level of significance, but approached significance between the .06 and .10 levels.

What appears clear from Table 15 is that the Sheffield teachers were different from the other teachers in the greater extent to which their image of a teacher expressing care contained behaviors of creating a positive classroom climate and preparing for class. They also seem different from the other teachers in the greater extent to which their picture of a teacher asserting control contained behaviors of creating a positive atmosphere for learning and a respectful relationship, and using non-aversive methods. The Frankfurt teachers appear to stand out from the other teachers in that their

vision of a teacher asserting control includes more behaviors of having an organized educational plan and directing student behavior through rules and expectations. The difference of the Flint teachers is that their vision of a teacher expressing care and asserting control contains less of each of the behaviors which the Sheffield teachers more frequently mentioned and which the Frankfurt teachers more frequently mentioned. What appears as a most interesting, and possibly rich finding is the overlappingness of the Sheffield teachers' image of care and image of control as signalled in their greater inclusion of the creation of a positive atmosphere in both.

A Verbal Definition

A second approach which was used to understand the meaning which the teachers have of care and control was to elicit the extent to which they attribute certain characteristics to the act of " . . . A TEACHER PROVIDING CARE for students while trying to help them learn and develop," and the extent to which they attribute these same characteristics to the act of " . . . A TEACHER PROVIDING CONTROL for students while trying to help them learn and develop." This was accomplished through two semantic differential instruments, each with the same ten 7-point scales (bipolar adjectives), but one using the concept of TEACHER CARE and one using the concept of TEACHER CONTROL. After responding to the COMPLETING THE STATEMENT instrument described in the prior section above, the teacher was handed the TEACHER CARE semantic differential instrument to complete and then the TEACHER CONTROL instrument.

TABLE 16

TEACHERS' VERBAL DEFINITIONS OF CARE ON TEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES

DESCRIPTIONS	FLINT (N=35) Mean	FRANKFURT (N=12) Mean	SHEFFIELD (N=10) Mean	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISON
Good-bad	6.56	6.83	6.80	.71	.49	
Sweet-sour	5.56	4.75	5.20	1.41	.25	
Hot-cold	6.34	6.09	6.10	.33	.72	
Helpful-unhelpful	6.69	6.08	6.80	1.78	.18	
Active-passive	6.31	6.33	5.10	3.41	.04	Fl,Fr>S
Strong-weak	6.26	5.00	6.20	3.75	.03	Fl,S>Fr
Pleasant-unpleasant	6.37	6.08	6.10	.32	.73	
Direct-indirect	5.51	5.92	5.20	.71	.49	
Deep-shallow	6.00	5.18	5.40	1.98	.15	
Important-unimportant	6.71	6.58	6.30	.76	.47	
Evaluation	6.37	6.20	6.24	.18	.83	
Potency	6.13	5.17	5.80	3.02	.06	Fl,Sh>Fr
Activity	6.33	6.25	5.60	1.88	.16	
Total	6.31	5.97	6.00	.89	.42	

Lowest Possible Score = 1 Highest Possible Score = 7

TABLE 17

TEACHERS' VERBAL DEFINITION OF CONTROL
ON TEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES

DESCRIPTIONS	FLINT (N=35) Mean	FRANKFURT (N=11) Mean	SHEFFIELD (N=10) Mean	F	P	PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
Good-bad	5.73	3.36	6.50	9.78	.0002	Fl,S>Fr
Sweet-sour	4.67	2.71	4.40	4.35	.02	Fl,S>Fr
Hot-cold	4.97	2.50	4.80	8.06	.001	Fl,S>Fr
Helpful-unhelpful	6.03	4.27	6.00	4.46	.02	Fl,S>Fr
Active-passive	6.03	5.09	5.90	1.75	.18	
Strong-weak	5.91	4.90	6.40	2.61	.08	S>Fr
Pleasant-unpleasant	5.50	3.54	5.00	4.71	.01	Fl>Fr
Direct-indirect	5.20	5.82	5.80	.83	.44	
Deep-shallow	5.71	3.90	4.70	6.64	.003	Fl>Fr
Important-unimportant	6.34	4.60	6.00	4.95	.01	Fl,S>Fr
Evaluation	5.66	3.80	5.58	7.39	.001	Fl,S>Fr
Potency	5.81	4.54	5.55	4.41	.02	Fl>Fr
Activity	5.53	4.00	5.35	6.22	.004	Fl,S>Fr
Total	5.69	4.02	5.52	8.39	.001	Fl,S>Fr

Lowest Possible Score = 1 Highest Possible Score = 7

Table 16 displays the mean ratings for each bipolar adjective pair for each teacher group under the concept of care, followed by the F ratios and p's for the analysis of variance between the three groups. These are followed by the results of comparisons between pairs of groups when the F ratio reached at least a .05 level of significance. Also displayed is the same kind of information for the cluster of scales which comprise the Evaluation (goodness), Potency (strength), and Activity (motion and action) dimensions of a verbal definition. At the bottom of the table is the same kind of information for the grand means for the concept of care (using all scales except the Direct-Indirect scale). Table 17 provides exactly the same kind of information for the concept of control.

The Flint and Frankfurt teachers appear to attribute more activeness to the act of providing care than do the Sheffield teachers, and the Flint and Sheffield teachers seem to view that act as having more strength than do the Frankfurt teachers. Broadly, the Flint and Sheffield teachers view the act as being characterized by greater potency than do the Frankfurt teachers. The Flint and Sheffield teachers appear to have a consistently more positive picture of teacher control than do the Frankfurt teachers.

In Table 18, the differences between the verbal definitions of care and control for each of the teacher groups are presented. As to drawing differences between teacher care and teacher control, the Frankfurt teachers appear to draw the most (6 of 10 items), Flint the next most (5 of 10), and Sheffield least (3 of 10). The Sheffield teacher's tendency to view these teacher behaviors as more similar than different is further confirmed in the

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' VERBAL DEFINITIONS OF CARE TO THEIR VERBAL DEFINITIONS OF CONTROL ON TEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES

DESCRIPTIONS	FLINT (N=35)				FRANKFURT (N=11)				SHEFFIELD (N=10)			
	CARE (Mean)	CONTROL (Mean)	t	p	CARE (Mean)	CONTROL (Mean)	t	p	CARE (Mean)	CONTROL (Mean)	t	p
Good-bad	6.56	5.88	2.00	.05	6.82	3.36	7.01	.0000	6.80	6.50	.82	.43
Sweet-sour	5.56	4.66	2.76	.009	4.86	2.71	2.03	.09	5.20	4.40	1.81	.10
Hot-cold	6.32	4.97	4.17	.0002	6.00	2.50	4.20	.002	6.10	4.80	2.90	.02
Helpful-unhelpful	6.68	6.03	2.21	.03	6.00	4.27	2.93	.01	6.80	6.00	2.45	.04
Active-passive	6.31	6.03	1.24	.22	6.27	5.09	1.88	.09	5.10	5.90	-2.06	.07
Strong-weak	6.26	5.88	1.26	.22	5.00	4.91	.13	.90	6.20	6.40	- .48	.64
Pleasant-unpleasant	6.35	5.50	2.67	.01	6.09	3.54	4.18	.002	6.10	5.00	2.40	.04
Direct-indirect	5.51	5.20	1.05	.30	5.91	5.81	.29	.78	5.20	5.80	-1.33	.23
Deep-shallow	6.00	5.68	1.16	.25	5.00	3.90	2.28	.05	5.40	4.70	1.41	.19
Important-unimportant	6.71	6.34	1.60	.12	6.80	4.60	5.28	.0005	6.30	6.00	.60	.56
Evaluation	6.35	5.66	2.64	.01	6.20	3.80	5.02	.0005	6.24	5.58	2.31	.05
Potency	6.13	5.78	1.47	.15	5.09	4.54	1.08	.31	5.80	5.55	.73	.48
Activity	6.33	5.53	3.81	.0006	6.18	4.00	4.71	.0008	5.60	5.35	.81	.44
Total	6.31	5.69	2.87	.007	5.94	4.02	4.66	.0009	6.00	5.52	1.78	.11

Lowest Possible Score = 1 Highest Possible Score = 7

non-existence of significant differences between their total scores for care and control. Of course, this appears consistent with the overlappingness of these concepts in the Sheffield responses to the sentence completion instrument. An added observation from the data in Table 18, is that neither of the three teacher groups differentiated between care and control on the scales of active-passive, strong-weak, or direct-indirect.

In further exploration of possible differences in care and control between teachers from the three cultural settings, another manipulation of data was conducted. Each of the teacher statements of good practice with their associated reasons for being called good practice were examined to see whether each good practice contained elements of care or elements of control. The native responses which teachers gave to the sentence completion instrument on care and control and from which the care and control categories in Table 15 were abstracted, as well as the categories themselves, were used as the criteria source for deciding on whether a good practice contained elements of care or of control. Then each teacher's statements of good practice, with their assigned values of care or control, were counted to see if the teacher had more care than control in the teacher's good practices, or more control than care, or equal amounts of care and control. Table 19 displays the percentage of teachers in each of the three cultural settings whose array of good practice statements fell within each of the three above-mentioned categories, along with the chi square value and associated level of significance. From this perspective, Sheffield teachers appear as significantly more controlling than caring in their good practices while Flint and Frankfurt teachers appear significantly more caring than controlling.

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHOSE GOOD PRACTICES CONTAINED MORE CARE THAN CONTROL, MORE CONTROL THAN CARE, AND EQUAL AMOUNTS OF CARE AND CONTROL

SETTING	Care>Control	Care=Control	Control>Care
FRANKFURT (N=12)	67%	25%	8%
FLINT (N=33)	58%	9%	33%
SHEFFIELD (N=32)	34%	0%	66%

$x^2 = 15.19$ df = 4 p = .01

Speculative Questions

Both the findings of a substantive nature and the experiences with methods of data collection and strategies of international collaboration have served the Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program well in providing learnings pre-requisite to moving ahead with a large scale, cross-cultural study. The beginnings of that study are already in progress and data collection is set for Fall 1985. But, to what can one legitimately speak regarding teaching practice in West Germany, England, and the United States from the microscopic view provided by the small study reported in the foregoing pages? Very little, perhaps, except if one is receptive to self-conciously engage in an admitted flight of fancy and ask the question: If the findings of this small study were true for mid-West Germany, the midlands of England, and midwestern United States, then what? This is the premise on which the last section of this paper is based -- to assume the study was macroscopic rather than microscopic, and that what is being seen in a sub-sub system may also be seen in the total system. The absurdity of such a move is clear, but the questions which emerge may sensitize one to potential issues in the cross-cultural study of teaching practice. These questions follow.

Given that the headmaster and rector, who have administrative leadership roles in the English and West German schools respectively, also have teaching roles -- which would seem to bring them into symmetry with teachers (Fuhr, 1979)(HMI Inspectorate, 1977) moreso than the principal in the U.S. schools -- how does one explain the finding that lack of administrative cooperation and support is reported more often by both the West German teachers and U.S. teachers as a barrier to good practice?

To what extent does the more deliberate view of the headmaster as the master teacher, or the more prescribed administrative responsibilities of rectors, or the policy that teachers are regionally assigned to West German schools rather than hired by school district personnel contribute to W. German teachers seeing their rector as more of a barrier to good practice than English teachers?

What can U.S. and West German schools put into use from English school leadership policy and practice, especially with the likely ontological and valuational differences between the three cultural settings?

What are the effects of a more integrative (English) perspective on the exercise of care and control by teachers as contrasted with a more separative (U.S., West German) perspective by teachers upon student learning and development, classroom climate, teaching practice, etc?

What are the culturally based sources of West German teachers' perceptions of themselves and their colleagues as engaging in good practice to a lesser extent than the perceptions which U.S. and English teachers have of themselves and their colleagues?

What are the factors behind the common finding across cultural settings that teachers view themselves as engaging in good practice moreso than their colleagues?

How is it that English teachers report more activity in interacting and meeting with colleagues on student and school issues than do U.S. teachers, when participative management of organizations is espoused as being more normative in the U.S.?

What is the source of a more self-oriented attitude among U.S. teachers than among English teachers?

Are there differences between English, West German, and U.S. teachers in the extents of their use of the equally espoused good practice of helping students move ahead at their own rate and abilities?

How is it that more English teachers than U.S. and West German teachers are more controlling than caring in their good practices when the English schools have purposely developed teacher-involved pastoral care programs (Best, Jarvis, Ribbins, 1977; Poppleton, et al, 1984) to increase the services of care to students?

What are the implications for preservice and inservice education for West German teachers' viewing their own lack of effective planning, use of effective teaching methods, and background, experience and knowledge as barriers to good practice moreso than U.S. or English teachers do?

What are the implications for policy and practice in schools in regard to the finding that teachers in all three settings experience a lack of flexibility in time, program, and student load as a major barrier to their carrying out good practices?

REFERENCES

Best, R.E., Jarvis, C.B., Ribbins, P.M. Pastoral care: Concept and process. British Journal of Educational Studies, 1977, 25, 124-135.

Boyd, R.D. and Menlo, A. Solving problems of practice in education: A prescriptive model for the use of scientific information. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 1984, 6, 59-74.

Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program. Issues, problems, and challenges in cross-cultural, comparative, collaborative research on teaching practice. Paper presented at The 12th Annual Conference of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research, Washington, D.C. 1983.

Fuhr, C. Education and teaching in the federal republic of Germany: A survey. Munich: Carl Hanser Verlog in conjunction with INTER NATIONES, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1979.

HMI Inspectorate of Schools. Ten good schools: A secondary school enquiry. London: Department of Education and Science, 1977.

Osgood, C., Suci, G., and Tannenbaum, P. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Poppleton, P., et al Good pastoral case in two Sheffield secondary comprehensive schools: The teachers' perspective. Sheffield: University of Sheffield Division of Education, 1984.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Pilot Study Interview Schedule
Project on Good Practice, Care, and control
Frankfurt-Michigan-Sheffield Cross-Cultural Study Program
May 1982

As you may already know, a group of faculty members of the School of Education of The University of Michigan are interested in learning about the ideas and beliefs held by educators as to what good educational practice is all about. More specifically, we want to know what people like yourself think "good" teachers do which makes them effective. Colleagues of ours in Sheffield, England, and in Frankfurt, West Germany are engaged in similar efforts. One of our long-range goals is to see if there are differences in people's beliefs about these things from one country to another. To get us started, we have developed a set of questions which we are asking in order to find out what good educational practice is -- as viewed by teachers.

In order to limit the amount of interview time needed, I would like to tape record our conversation so I won't have to take down everything you say. We will treat any information you provide with the utmost confidence; no one in this school, at the University, or anywhere else will be able to link your name with your answers. The interview will probably last from one and a half to two hours; if we finish earlier, that's fine. Of course your participation in the interview is completely voluntary, in whole or in part.

If you have no questions or objections, I would like to turn on the tape recorder and begin the interview. Is this all right with you?

INTERVIEWER NAME _____

DATE_____ AND PLACE _____ OF INTERVIEW

1a. Subjects you teach: _____
_____
_____

b. Approximate number of students taught in most of your classes:
_____ (INTERVIEWER: WE ARE AFTER AVERAGE CLASS SIZE HERE)

c. Age levels of students you teach:
From _____ years old to _____ years old;
Mainly _____ years old

d. Number of years you have been teaching (all together)
_____

e. Number of years you have been teaching is this school district:
_____

f. Number of years you have been teaching in this school building:
_____

g. Amount of college work:
B.A. _____ plus _____
M.A. _____ plus _____
More _____

h. Age _____ or Date of Birth _____

i. Sex _____

2. I'm sure that, as a teacher in this school, there are many things you do to contribute to the learning and development of your students. I imagine that some of these things you do in small or large size groups, such as with students in class, school meetings with parents, meetings with other faculty and staff, etc. Some of these things you probably do on a one-to-one basis with an individual student, parent, faculty or staff member, etc. And then, some of these things you may do by yourself, like preparing for your classes, writing reports, etc.

   I would appreciate it if you could help me make a list of what some of these things are in each of these three areas; in groups, on a one-to-one basis, and by yourself. Just a few words about each will be sufficient -- unless you feel you need to say more in order to make sure I understand what that thing is.

   A. Could we begin with the things you do to contribute to the learning and development of students which take place in small or large groups (such as with students in class, in school meetings with parents, in meetings with other faculty and staff, etc.)

   (INTERVIEWER: RECORD EACH THING MENTIONED ON THE SEPARATE RESPONSE SHEET PROVIDED. PROBE TO GET UP TO, BUT NO MORE THAN, SIX UNLESS THE RESPONDENT INSISTS ON GIVING YOU MORE. HELP RESPONDENT TO KEEP RESPONSES BRIEF BUT SUFFICIENT FOR YOU TO BE CLEAR ABOUT WHAT EACH THING IS)

   B. Now, what about the things you do to contribute to the learning and development of students which take place in one-to-one situations (with an individual student, parent, faculty or staff member, etc.) What things do you think of?

   (INTERVIEWER: SEE INSTRUCTIONS FOR 2A ABOVE)

   C. Now, what about the things you do to contribute to the learning and development of students which you do by yourself (like preparing for your classes, writing reports, etc.)

   (INTERVIEWER: SEE INSTRUCTIONS FOR 2A ABOVE)

RESPONSE SHEET FOR QUESTION 2

(INTERVIEWER: RECORD ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 2A, 2B, AND 2C BELOW. ONCE ANSWERS HAVE BEEN RECORDED TO ALL THREE QUESTIONS, PROCEED WITH QUESTIONS 3-8 FOR EACH THING MENTIONED)

2A. Things done in small or large groups

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

2B. Things done in one-to-one situations

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

2C. Things done by yourself

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

(INTERVIEWER: RECORD ANSWERS TO 3-5 AS THEY ARE GIVEN OR NOTE NUMBERS ON TAPE WHERE EACH ANSWER BEGINS AND ENTER ANSWERS LATER BY REVIEWING TAPE)

3. The first thing you mentioned was: (INTERVIEWER REPEATS FIRST THING RECORDED ON RESPONSE SHEET) I imagine that some times you have (STATE THE THING MENTIONED) in a way which you think represents <u>better practice</u> than at other times. When you have (STATE THE THING MENTIONED) in a way which represents what you think of as better practice, what were the things you actually did? IF NEEDED, ADD: What did it look like as you were doing it? (PROBE FOR AN EXAMPLE OF ACTION, REFLECT IT BACK TO BE SURE YOU HAVE IT AS THE RESPONDENT INTENDED.)

4. Could you please tell me why <u>you</u> feel that this way is better than other ways? (AFTER RESPONDENT HAS GIVEN YOU RESPONSES, PROBE FOR ANYTHING ELSE, THEN REFLECT IT BACK TO BE SURE YOU HAVE IT AS INTENDED.)

	3.	4.
A	1. _____	1. _____
	2. _____	2. _____
	3. _____	3. _____
	4. _____	4. _____
	5. _____	5. _____
	6. _____	6. _____
	Other(s) _____	Other(s) _____
B	1. _____	1. _____
	2. _____	2. _____
	3. _____	3. _____
	4. _____	4. _____
	5. _____	5. _____
	6. _____	6. _____
	Other(s) _____	Other(s) _____
C	1. _____	1. _____
	2. _____	2. _____
	3. _____	3. _____
	4. _____	4. _____
	5. _____	5. _____
	6. _____	6. _____

5. For each of us, there are things which help us carry out better practice and there are things which block or hinder us from carrying out better practice. These can be things outside of ourselves, such as in the classroom, school or community; or these can be things inside ourselves, such as feelings, habits, etc.

A. What are the things which help you (STATE THE THING MENTIONED) in the way you described as better practice? (PROBE CATEGORIES OF SELF, OTHERS, POLICIES, CURRICULUM, MATERIAL, PHYSICAL PLANT, TIME, ETC.)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

B. What are the things which limit or block you from (STATE THE THING MENTIONED) in the way you described as better practice? (USE PROBES FROM 5A)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Other(s) _____

6. When you (STATE THE THING MENTIONED), how much of the time, generally speaking, do you do it the way you described as better practice? Please use the scale labelled 6&7 on this sheet (HAND THE SHEET WITH THE RESPONSE SCALES TO THE RESPONDENT) to give me your best estimate. (CHECK THE ANSWER GIVEN IN THE APPROPRIATE ROW BELOW)

	None of the time	A small amount of the time	Slightly less than half of the time	Slightly more than half of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
A. 1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. 1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. 1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. When other teachers in your school (STATE THE THING MENTIONED), what is your general impression of how often they do it the way you described as better practice? Please use the scale labelled 6&7 to give me your best estimate. (CHECK THE ANSWER GIVEN BELOW)

		None of the time	A small amount of the time	Slightly less than half of the time	Slightly more than half of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
A.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. How important do you feel it is for other teachers in your school to (STATE THE THING MENTIONED) in the way you described as better practice? Please use the scale labelled 8 on your sheet to give me your best estimate. (CHECK THE ANSWER BELOW. THEN GO BACK TO QUESTION 3 - page 3 - AND REPEAT QUESTIONS 3-8 FOR THE NEXT THING RECORDED. WHEN THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 8 HAS BEEN RECORDED FOR THE LAST THING MENTIONED IN 3C, TURN TO QUESTION 9 - page 8 - .)

		Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
A.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C.	1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Other(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

RESPONSE SCALES FOR QUESTIONS 6, 7, 8

6&7	None of the time	A small amount of the time	Slightly less than half of the time	Slightly more than half of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

---

8	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important

9. Are there any things you'd like to say about anything you mentioned, anything you did not mention, or anything about the interview, or whatever? (RECORD ANSWERS IN THE SPACE BELOW OR NOTE NUMBERS ON TAPE AND RECORD ANSWERS LATER AFTER REVIEWING TAPE)

THANK THE RESPONDENT FOR HIS/HER TIME AND PATIENCE.

APPENDIX B

TEACHER CARE

The daily work of teachers in trying to help students learn and develop includes a range of responsibilities, such as planning for class sessions, carrying out these plans in the classroom, seeing students individually and in small groups, developing and administering tests, reporting student progress, and other activities. Please use the following pairs of words to indicate what comes to mind for you when you think of A TEACHER PROVIDING CARE for students while trying to help them learn and develop. Between each pair of words place a check on that space that best indicates your thinking.

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
sweet	____	____	____	____	____	____	sour
cold	____	____	____	____	____	____	warm
helpful	____	____	____	____	____	____	unhelpful
passive	____	____	____	____	____	____	active
strong	____	____	____	____	____	____	weak
unpleasant	____	____	____	____	____	____	pleasant
direct	____	____	____	____	____	____	indirect
deep	____	____	____	____	____	____	shallow
unimportant	____	____	____	____	____	____	important

TEACHER CONTROL

The daily work of teachers in trying to help students learn and develop includes a range of responsibilities, such as planning for class sessions, carrying out these plans in the classroom, seeing students individually and in small groups, developing and administering tests, reporting student progress, and other activities. Please use the following pairs of words to indicate what comes to mind for you when you think of A TEACHER PROVIDING CONTROL for students while trying to help them learn and develop. Between each pair of words place a check on that space that best indicates your thinking.

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
sweet	____	____	____	____	____	____	sour
cold	____	____	____	____	____	____	warm
helpful	____	____	____	____	____	____	unhelpful
passive	____	____	____	____	____	____	active
strong	____	____	____	____	____	____	weak
unpleasant	____	____	____	____	____	____	pleasant
direct	____	____	____	____	____	____	indirect
deep	____	____	____	____	____	____	shallow
unimportant	____	____	____	____	____	____	important

COMPLETING THE STATEMENT

Please complete each of the following two statements as fully as you can, with all that comes to your mind.

1. You can tell that a teacher is providing CARE for students when the teacher...

2. You can tell that a teacher is providing CONTROL for students when the teacher...